## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 are currently amended. Claims 1-16 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following amendments and/or remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

### The Claim Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Salgado, U.S. Pat. No. 5,831,747 (Salgado). (Present Action, Paragraph 8).

Before undertaking a discussion of the substance of the Office's rejections, the following discussion of Salgado is provided in an attempt to help the Office appreciate various distinctions between the claimed embodiments and Salgado.

### The Salgado Reference

Generally, Salgado's disclosure is directed to framing an image portion in which a size attribute of the applicable frame is inputted with a user interface and dimensions of the image portion are stored in memory. (Salgado, at Abstract). Salgado next discloses using a processor to determine, by reference to this inputted size attribute and stored dimensions, whether a preselected relationship exists between the image portion and the applicable frame. (*Id.*). When the preselected relationship does not exist, Salgado discloses scaling the image portion with an image processing subsystem. (*Id.*).

The gist of Salgado's disclosure is perhaps best appreciated through column 2, lines 29 to 38. Here, Salgado discloses a system in accordance with Salgado's invention:

The system includes: a) a user interface for inputting a size attribute representative of the border to be generated, the size attribute defining a magnitude of the spacing between the inner border edge and the outer border edge; b) a processor for determining, by reference to the size attribute and the dimensions of the second set of dimensions, whether a preselected relationship exists between the second image portion and the border; and c) an image processing subsystem for scaling the second image portion, by a selected amount, when the preselected relationship does not exist.

Here Salgado discloses a usage for the user interface, which is "for inputting a size attribute". Salgado later discloses the user interface in greater detail, writing that "the user interface 14 enables an operator to control and monitor various operator adjustable functions and maintenance activities." (Salgado, column 3, lines 31-33). Salgado also discloses that this user interface 14 "may be a touch screen or any other suitable control panel, providing an operator interface with the system ... [and] may also display electronic documents on a display screen (not shown in FIG. 1)." (Salgado, column 3, lines 33-38).

### The Claims

The subject matter recited in each of the claims discussed below is patentably distinct from Salgado, as will become apparent.

**Claim 1** has been amended and recites a system for displaying an image at its selected size, wherein said ~~selected~~-image is configured for printing by a large format printer, said system comprising [amended language appears in bold italics]:

- a terminal for displaying a plurality of images, said terminal including an image program for enabling the display of at least

one of said images on said terminal, said image program being configured to enable the selection of a plurality of attributes of said image, wherein said selection of said plurality of attributes includes at least one option for selecting ~~the~~ *large format* dimensions for said image; and

- a display device for displaying said ~~selected~~ image according to said selected, *large format* dimensions, such that said image is displayed at its selected, *large format* dimensions.

In regard to the Office's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, the Office writes that "the limitations 'said selected image' in line 2 and 'the dimensions' in line 8-9 of the claim" have insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant amends claim 1 to read "said ~~selected~~ image" in lines 2 and 10 and "~~the~~ ... dimensions" in line 8. Applicant respectfully asserts that these amendments obviate the grounds for this rejection.

In making out various claim rejections under §102 in the present Office Action, the Office argues that Salgado discloses "a display device for displaying said selected image ... at its selected dimensions." The Office contends that this element is disclosed in column 6, lines 24-67 and in Fig. 2. (Present Action, paragraph 9).

Consider the text appearing in column 6, lines 60-63, the entirety of which is provided below for the Office's convenience:

> Fourth, a representation is displayed on a display screen of the UI 14 (Fig. 1), for permitting the user to confirm that the frame/image composite is acceptable.

Also consider Fig. 2, cited by the Office, which simply shows a schematic diagram from handling inputs, calculating a frame and image data, and outputting a composite frame/image.

Figure 2 and the above text cited by the Office do not disclose or suggest a "a display device for displaying said selected image ... at its selected, *large format* dimensions."

Further, Salgado continues to define and describe this user interface 14. Salgado discloses the user interface in greater detail, writing that "the user interface 14 enables an operator to control and monitor various operator adjustable functions and maintenance activities." (Salgado, column 3, lines 31-33). This text of Salgado simply does not disclose "a display device for displaying said selected image ... at its selected, *large format* dimensions."

Salgado also discloses that this user interface 14 "may be a touch screen or any other suitable control panel, providing an operator interface with the system ... [and] may also display electronic documents on a display screen." (Salgado, column 3, lines 33-38). Salgado's disclosure, shown in Fig. 1, teaches that the user interface 14 is small and control-panel like. Further, while Salgado describes, at column 6, lines 60-63, the user interface 14 as displaying a frame/image composite to aid a user in confirming that the frame/image composite is acceptable, it is performed at the small size taught in Fig. 1. Salgado simply does not disclose or suggest displaying an image at any appreciable size. Thus, in this text and figure, Salgado discloses a user interface that is too small and not usable as a "display device for displaying said selected image ... at its selected, *large format* dimensions."

Salgado simply neither discloses nor suggests the claimed display device. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

**Claims 2-10** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither

‹disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Claim 11** has been amended and recites a method for displaying an image at its selected size and printing said image, said method comprising the steps of [amended language appears in bold italics]:

- displaying at least one selectable image on a terminal;
- displaying a plurality of attribute options for said at least one selectable image on said terminal, wherein one of said attribute options includes *large format* dimensions for said selected image;
- displaying said selected image according to its selected, *large format* dimensions on a viewing surface; and
- printing said selected image on a print medium having at least an A3 size on a large format printer.

As set forth above, Salgado does not disclose or suggest "displaying said selected image according to its selected, *large format* dimensions."

For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that this claim is allowable.

**Claims 12-16** depend from claim 11 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 11 are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

## Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is anything other 5 than a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a phone call to discuss scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

10      Date: _21 Jan 04_      By: _Michael K. Colby_
                                    Michael K. Colby
                                    Reg. No. 45,816
                                    (509) 324-9256 ext. 240